

**UNIVERSITY OF
FORWARD
THINKING
WESTMINSTER** 

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**The ASEAN community-based tourism standards: looking
beyond certification**

Novelli, M., Klatte, N. and Dolezal, C.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Tourism Planning & Development*, 14 (2), pp. 260-281. The final definitive version is available online:

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2016.1243146>

© 2016 Taylor & Francis

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

**The ASEAN Community-Based Tourism Standards: looking
beyond certification.**

Journal:	<i>Tourism Planning & Development</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	article
Keywords:	ASEAN, benchmarking, certification, community-based tourism, standards, Sustainable Tourism

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review Only

The ASEAN Community-Based Tourism Standards: looking beyond certification.

Abstract

This paper reports findings from an opportunity study on the appropriateness of implementing community-based tourism standards (CBTS) certification through the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) criteria, as a way to improve sustainable tourism provision in the region. Framed by critical reflections on community-based tourism (CBT) literature and existing sustainable tourism standards (STS) practices, qualitative research consisting of interviews with six key industry experts provided core insights into a number of CBTS' implementation challenges. Findings indicate the main hindering factors for the implementation of CBTS to be the lack of adequate governance, limited funding and insufficient community capacity. The study concluded that although at the moment the full implementation of CBTS as a certification programme would be premature, ASEAN-CBTS' criteria are a useful benchmarking and strategic planning tool for local communities, which would eventually lead to improved CBT benefits, standards and performance in the region. At the same time, this paper argues that aspects including CBT competitiveness and service delivery need to be tackled first to create fruitful grounding for CBT certification.

Introduction

During the last three decades, the concept of sustainability has permutated into people's consciousness, government policies and development strategies, with community-based tourism (CBT) as one of the widely sought after alternative and sustainable tourism solutions.

Despite its variable levels of successes around the world (Novelli, 2016), in South East Asia, CBT has been portrayed as one of the most meaningful and supportive ways to enhance

1
2
3
4 community development and income generation for marginalised communities – even if it
5
6 often comes with criticisms relating to local power inequalities, participation and lack of local
7
8 capacity (Dolezal, 2015a, 2015b). A proliferating number of international development
9
10 agencies (IDAs) and NGOs explicitly engage with CBT with the specific mandate to assist
11
12 communities in understanding the concept, benefits and opportunities, as well as dealing with
13
14 its implementation challenges.
15
16

17
18
19 In response to the growth of CBT in the region, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations'¹
20
21 (ASEAN) tourism ministries joined forces in their plea for the development of common
22
23 regional community-based tourism standards (CBTS) with their primary objective to promote
24
25 a more sustainable approach in the planning and development of CBT. The present research
26
27 investigates these standards and is framed by critical reflections on CBT literature and
28
29 existing sustainable tourism standards (STS) practices, namely the Sustainable Tourism
30
31 Criteria Initiative, Green Globe and the CBTS of the Community-Based Tourism Institute
32
33 Thailand (also referred to as CBT-I standards) and offers key findings from qualitative
34
35 research conducted with industry experts. This paper critically assesses the appropriateness of
36
37 ASEAN-CBTS as a certification tool and reflects upon its implementation challenges,
38
39 opportunities and attempts to contribute to the broader debate on CBT planning and
40
41 development in the ASEAN context.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 ¹ ASEAN is the acronym used to refer to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, which was established on
53
54 8 August 1967 in Bangkok (Thailand), where the ASEAN Declaration (or Bangkok Declaration) was signed by
55
56 its founder members, namely Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. Brunei Darussalam later
57
58 joined on 7 January 1984, Viet Nam on 28 July 1995, Lao PDR and Myanmar on 23 July 1997, and Cambodia
59
60 on 30 April 1999, making up what is today the ten Member States of ASEAN (ASEAN, 2014).

1
2
3
4 A number of challenges emerged primarily associated with the lack of adequate governance,
5 limited funding and insufficient capacity within the community. These factors all contribute
6 to hindering the successful implementation of CBTS. The study identified that although the
7 implementation of an ASEAN-CBTS regional certification was a premature objective, its
8 criteria are a useful benchmarking and strategic planning tool for local communities, which
9 would eventually lead to improved CBT benefits, standards and performance in the region.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **1. Community Based Tourism - A Critical Overview**

21 Generally proposed as an approach to foster community development in developing countries,
22 CBT finds its roots in the 1970s' ambition of involving communities in bottom-up
23 development (Reid, Mair & George, 2004). This idea was first championed in tourism by
24 Murphy (1983, 1985, 1988), through his 'community-driven tourism planning' propositions
25 associated with a developed country context, which evolved into today's CBT, happening
26 mainly, but not only, in the developing world. CBT has become the focus of a rich body of
27 studies critiquing its concept and application, as well as a set of case studies from developing
28 nations in the Asia-Pacific region, the Middle East, South America and Africa (Aref, 2011;
29 Erskine & Meyer, 2012; Snyman, 2012a, 2012b; Wearing & McDonald, 2002). CBT is
30 generally understood as encompassing the active participation of communities in the
31 planning, implementation and management of tourism in order to provide wider benefits for
32 the community (Goodwin & Santilli, 2009) than would traditionally have been the case.
33 Notwithstanding its value, CBT models have been criticised for being overly reliant on
34 Western ideas of development, which inform the agendas of IDAs, governments and NGO's
35 with little attention being paid to local views and knowledge (Le, Weaver & Lawton,2012).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 CBT has been used as a rural diversification strategy for community development, especially
5
6 in those remote areas characterized by limited alternatives for economic development. Whilst
7
8 it has been praised for fostering essential rural grassroots community participation in tourism
9
10 development (Moscardo, 2008; Leksakundilok & Hirsch, 2008; Rocharungsat, 2008), it has
11
12 also been criticised for providing incongruent objectives and raising unachievable
13
14 expectations for local socio-economic growth (Goodwin & Santilli, 2009; Scheyvens, 2002)
15
16 or for being a mere ‘window dressing exercise’ (Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007). In some cases,
17
18 the lack of community involvement in the planning process has led to inter-community
19
20 conflict and tensions (Reid, et al., 2004; Stoeckl, 2008) and unequal power relations between
21
22 villagers themselves but also between villagers and outside actors (Dolezal, 2015a). If CBT “is
23
24 intended to maximise the participation of local people in decision making from a very early
25
26 stage” (Smith & Duffy, 2003, p. 138) communities need to be integrated in the planning
27
28 process, so that they can gain power and responsibility to decide on the direction and the
29
30 nature of the tourism development (Smith & Duffy, 2003; Leksakundilok & Hirsch, 2008;
31
32 Suansri, 2013) and therefore any development can be better implemented and managed (Li,
33
34 2004; Rocharungsat, 2008).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Models of best practices have been drafted that are aimed at improving the way in which CBT
43
44 can provide holistic community benefits (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013, 2014), but their
45
46 application remains case specific. Communities require clear guidelines on how to develop
47
48 and successfully implement a tourism product and how to devise marketing and visitor
49
50 management strategies, all of which cannot be achieved without the adequate set of skills
51
52 (Stoeckl, 2008). Tourism as a service industry greatly benefits when host communities’ show
53
54 motivation and are prepared to meet visitors’ needs, which in turn increases tourists’
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 willingness to visit as a result of improved tourism products and services that are delivered by
5
6 positively inclined and prepared staff (Rocharungsat, 2008).
7
8
9

10 Besides varying CBT practices, evidence suggest that also degrees of actual community
11 participation vary, from communities actively involved in decision making, to limited
12 involvement at later stages of the tourism development process, to only being perfunctory
13 consulted (Johnson & Wilson, 2000; Mitchell & Eagles, 2010). The intervention of outsiders,
14 such as IDAs and NGOs, providing funding or technical assistance to some communities and
15 none to others has in some cases lead to new forms of social and economic division, including
16 intra- and inter- community rivalry (Smith & Duffy, 2003). Most importantly, this has often
17 ignored existing stakeholders' power relations (Novelli 2016). In fact, the claim of working
18 'in partnership' with a beneficiary community, often leads to power inequalities and
19 confusions in regards to responsibilities and the degrees of control and decision-making
20 (Dolezal, 2015). Knowledgeable outsiders experience advantages over the local population
21 when planning and making decisions, oftentimes leading community members to experience
22 frustration and a feeling of not-being-heard by those with a better understanding of the sector
23 (Reid et al., 2004), who oftentimes take decisions on their behalf. The power relationship
24 divide is exacerbated by local communities form peripheral regions having very little or no
25 experience in being a tourist or in handling tourism and visitors (Pearce, et al., 1996;
26 Leksakundilok & Hirsch, 2008). In addition, concealed power differences within a
27 community, such as age, gender or belonging to a certain social group can influence
28 participation and partnerships (Johnson & Wilson, 2000), thus furthering power inequalities
29 and increasing the risk of CBT resulting in poor performance and failure (Hall, 2005; Stoeckl,
30 2008).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Over the past three decades, a number of initiatives to address afore mentioned challenges
7 associated with CBT have taken place. For instance, the UN World Tourism Organisation
8 (UNWTO) have a history of holding seminars, workshops and conferences specifically
9 aimed at increasing awareness, providing education and support in the implementation of
10 sustainable tourism practices (Rocharungsat, 2008). In addition, organisations, including
11 IDAs and NGOs, have been providing skills training and education specifically related to the
12 planning and development of local CBT groups, project management, tour guiding, marketing
13 and monitoring of operations (Suansri, 2013; Suansri & Richards, 2009). However, the
14 general lack of a common understanding and inconsistent application of CBT makes any
15 validation, benchmarking and monitoring of business practices extremely difficult (Smith &
16 Duffy, 2003). While CBT gained momentum as a reflection of the sustainable tourism
17 development agenda (Smith & Duffy, 2003; Leksakundilok & Hirsch, 2008; Rocharungsat,
18 2008; WCED, 1987; Baker, Kousis, Richardson & Young, 1997; Pridham &
19 Konstadakopulos, 1997; Weaver, 2006; Goessling, Hall & Weaver., 2009), CBTS have
20 emerged from STS as a tool to improve the CBT sector. However, their appropriateness,
21 feasibility and effectiveness as a certification tool remain questionable.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **2. Tourism Industry Standards and Sustainability**

44
45
46 Tourism Industry Standards (TIS) are a documented set of rules, conditions and requirements,
47 developed and published by a recognised body, which can either require the achievement of
48 certain performance indicators or the implementation of specific management strategies.
49 Applicants are assessed and verified according to those specific criteria and, if all
50 requirements are met, certified with, for example, a specific label or award (Font, 2002a). One
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of the main aims of labelling and certification schemes is to encourage stakeholders to meet
5
6 certain standards (Font, 2002b) and to ensure that both the market demand and supply sides
7
8 understand and implement business best practices (Diamantis & Westlake, 2001).
9

10
11
12 Where governments have imposed TIS, these have proved to have an influence on regulatory
13
14 frameworks, such as: penal liability and legislation; facilitation and financing of technical
15
16 assistance and funding applications; monitoring, verification and surveillance of correct
17
18 practices in tourism (Font & Bendell, 2002; Bendell & Font, 2004). Historically, TIS focused
19
20 on quality and health and safety issues, leaving sustainability out of the equation. Those that
21
22 started addressing sustainability, mostly centred around environmental issues, such as water
23
24 or waste management (Font & Bendell, 2002; Bendell & Font, 2004; Font & Harris, 2004)
25
26 and focused only years later on social issues such as corporate social-responsibility (Beckett
27
28 & Jonker, 2002; Font & Harris, 2004; Strambach & Surmeier, 2013; Landthaler, 2014).
29
30 Although what followed was a greater emphasis on social issues (Griffin & De Lacy, 2002;
31
32 Font & Harris, 2004), a focus on social aspects within TIS proved problematic, as it was open
33
34 to subjective interpretations by auditors (Font & Harris, 2004).
35
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 STS have gained importance as a consequence of increased public awareness about TIS,
43
44 consumer rights and sustainability. They have become a benchmarking tool in business
45
46 practices and a source of credibility and transparency for customers and tourism providers
47
48 (Strambach & Surmeier, 2013). Sustainability labels and eco-certificates help identifying
49
50 tourism organisation, which respectively adopt sustainable tourism and eco-friendly practices
51
52 (Font, 2001; Font & Harris, 2004). They can contribute towards transparency and good
53
54 governance, motivate stakeholders to adapt planning and monitoring approaches, support
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 market confidence and access, improve product and service quality (Suansri & Yeejaw-haw,
5
6 2013) and increase competitive advantage and corporate image (Jarvis, Weeden & Simcock,
7
8 2010). During the last decade, while the drastic increase of voluntary standards has generally
9
10 had a positive influence on industry performances (Font, 2002a; Font, 2002b; Bendell & Font,
11
12 2004), the rapid proliferation of STS, including over 400 generic sustainability criteria
13
14 (Landthaler, 2014) and 100 plus labelling programmes using the term 'eco', has resulted in
15
16 diluted credibility, competitive advantage and practical significance, with many being used as
17
18 a mere marketing tool (Self, et al, 2010; Francis & Goodwin, 2009; Jarvis, et al., 2010), which
19
20 is something to be considered when aspiring to develop and implement CBTS.
21
22
23
24
25

26 **2.1 The Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria**

27
28 An important step towards the development of STS was the introduction of the Global
29
30 Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC), which emerged in response to the United Nations'
31
32 Millennium Goals (UNMDGs) with the aims of encouraging "effective sustainability
33
34 planning, maximizing social and economic benefits for the local community, enhancing
35
36 cultural heritage, and reducing [tourism's] negative impacts to the environment" (GSTC,
37
38 2013a, p. 1). GSTS serve as basic benchmarking for businesses to comply with and for
39
40 consumers to identify and choose sustainable tourism products. They offer starting points for
41
42 sustainable certificate development and act as guidelines for training and educational
43
44 purposes (GSTC, 2013a). GSTC (2014) is an NGO, run on a voluntary basis and funded by
45
46 donations, membership fees and sponsorships. GSTC addresses two main categories – 'hotels
47
48 and tour operators' and 'destinations', which are assessed according to four thematic criteria,
49
50 each sub-divided into indicators (Table 1).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 INSERT Table 1: Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (Source: Adapted from GSTC, 2013a,
5
6 2013b)
7
8
9

10 Although, at destination level, the criteria include a number of important indicators, such as
11 monitoring, visitor satisfaction, safety, security and local career opportunities, aspects such as
12 accommodation, local guides or boarding are missing. These are important for developing,
13 monitoring and evaluating CBT performances, therefore restricting GSTC usefulness to CBT.
14 GSTC have been criticised on a number of fronts, as a 'wish list' with insufficient and
15 inflexible measurements, as an opaque certification process lacking of transparency with
16 consumers not being able to give feedback or identify whether the criteria have actually been
17 met in practice (Francis & Goodwin, 2009). Furthermore, the implementation of GSTC is
18 costly and their applicability to CBT remains limited due to community restricted financial
19 resources, making them unable to meet the certification costs.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **2.2 Green Globe 21**

38
39 'Green Globe 21 is the global Affiliation, Benchmarking and Certification programme for
40 sustainable travel and tourism' (Walker, 2008) and provides accreditation, training and
41 education, as well as marketing services all over the world (Griffin & De Lacy, 2002; Green
42 Globe Certification, 2014a). It is perceived as the 'International Ecotourism Standard', having
43 been established by Ecotourism Australia and the Cooperative Research Centre for
44 Sustainable Tourism of Australia, based on Agenda 21 principles, the Australian Nature and
45 Ecotourism Accreditation and GSTC (Green Globe Certification, 2014a). It has been
46 developed with input from the private sector, communities and other tourism stakeholders
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 (Green Globe Certification, 2014b), and includes four standards, which are each subdivided
5
6 into indicators (table 2).
7
8
9

10
11 **INSERT Table 2: The Green Globe Certification Criteria (Green Globe Certification,**
12
13 **2014c)**
14

15
16
17 Similarly to the GSTC, although the Green Globe 21 Criteria provides an overview of
18
19 required business practices, it does not give any guidelines on how to achieve these, which is
20
21 particularly needed for the development of CBT.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 **2.3 The Thai Community Based Tourism Standards and ASEAN**
30

31 In the last two decades, in Southeast Asia, a number of NGOs have been involved in CBT and
32
33 have delivered several capacity building and community development initiatives. However, in
34
35 order to comply with growing tourist numbers, increased competitiveness and market access,
36
37 the need to improve product and service quality and sustainable practices has emerged,
38
39 stimulating the demand for CBTS (Suansri & Yeejaw-haw, 2013). In 2013, the Thai
40
41 Community Based Tourism Institute (CBT-I) Standards were introduced, consisting of five
42
43 criteria, each subdivided into indicators (table 3). The standards' main aim was to "clarify and
44
45 protect community rights" (Suansri & Yeejaw-haw, 2013, p. 7). Although, being accredited
46
47 by an external organisation was seen as a source of pride for the community, which would
48
49 result in increased credibility, improved market access and a boost in stakeholders'
50
51 confidence in the sector (Suansri & Yeejaw-haw, 2013), the CBT-I Standards remain a self-
52
53 assessing, benchmarking and guiding tool, rather than a certification.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INSERT Table 3: The Thai CBT-I Standards (Source: Adapted from Suansri and Yeejaw-haw, 2013)

The indicators are assessed in the form of a CBTS self-administered checklist with answers including 'yes', 'no' or 'not applicable', aimed at enabling the community to self-assess strengths, weaknesses and gaps in their CBT practice as well as identify areas which they wish to develop (Suansri & Yeejaw-haw, 2013). However, since most communities develop CBT as a source of supplementary income, a main concern with the effectiveness of this CBTS is the availability of funds to support external audits. As a consequence, data may be manipulated during self-audits, which leads to the assessment process including questions with regard to transparency, truthfulness and reliability and, thus, legitimacy. Additionally, some of the indicators are vague and do not provide any measurable parameters. For example, when stated 'Homestay homes and activities use water efficiently' the word 'efficiently' is not accompanied by a definition, nor quantifiable parameters. Adding to the complexity are the different circumstances depending on the CBT context (Suansri & Yeejaw-haw, 2013). For instance, a CBT project attracting tourists to Thailand's hill tribes may have very different environmental settings compared to a fishing community in the Philippines. As a consequence, indicators such as noise pollution, health and safety or accommodation arrangements will vary considerably. The CBT-I Standards therefore provide a comprehensive set of CBTS, but their specific geographical focus on Thailand restricts its relevance and applicability to other ASEAN destinations. A collaborative approach by ASEAN destinations to better understand and harmonise different CBTS' practices would be required to produce a cohesive set of ASEAN-CBTS, if at all possible.

3. Research Setting and Methodology

3.1 The Research Setting

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) was established in 1967, with Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore and the Philippines as founding members, later joined by Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Myanmar and Brunei (ASEAN, 2014a). The main aims and mandate of the association are: to accelerate economic growth and social development; to strengthen and promote peace and stability in the region and amongst all members; and to facilitate mutual assistance, collaboration and support in education, infrastructure, agriculture and other industries (ASEAN Secretariat, 2014b). Southeast Asia, with its unique and rich cultural and natural resources, has experienced rapid tourism growth (Son, Pigram & Rugendyke, 1999; Rocharungsat, 2008), with sustainable development practices becoming recognised as being of great importance for the protection of ecosystems, the reduction of the negative impacts of mass tourism and the facilitation of sustainable economic benefits for local populations (Dolezal & Trupp, 2015; Mitchell & Eagles, 2010). Historically, the Asia-Pacific region has been at the forefront in the development and implementation of sustainable tourism practices (Dowling, 2000; Leksakundilok & Hirsch, 2008). This has largely resulted from the work of the Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA), one of the first organisations to develop an environmental ethics programme and integrating sustainability in their code of conduct (Dowling, 2000; PATA, 2014). In the early 1990s, The International Tourism Society was one of the first organisations to establish ecotourism guidelines in Thailand, followed by the National Ecotourism Policy introduced by the Thai Government in 1997 (Dowling, 2000; Leksakundilok and Hirsch, 2008). Supported by the Thailand Research Fund (TRF), the CBT-I is another example of a local NGO committed to “provide support and facilitate cooperation

1
2
3
4 among stakeholders from grassroots communities to international levels, [and] strengthen the
5
6 capacity of Thai communities to manage tourism sustainably” (Suansri & Richards, 2009, p.
7
8 116). Since 2006, the CBT-I has been working tirelessly in collaboration with communities,
9
10 the government, NGOs, academies and responsible tourism businesses by providing study
11
12 tours, training workshops, consultancy and general support to key tourism stakeholders
13
14 (Suansri & Richards, 2009).
15
16
17
18
19

20 Despite evident good practice when it comes to CBT in Thailand, this has not been replicated
21
22 across the ASEAN region. In some ASEAN destinations, sustainable tourism has experienced
23
24 substantial implementation challenges particularly associated with the lack of infrastructures,
25
26 skills and training facilities as well as political instability (Dowling, 2000), which has
27
28 particularly affected the wider success of CBT in the region. However, given the increase in
29
30 demand for CBT and some CBT successes in the region (Suansri, 2013), ASEAN decided that
31
32 a set of standards was required for CBT to guarantee a consistent experience across its
33
34 member states (ASEAN, 2014c).
35
36
37
38
39

40 **3.2 Methodology**

41
42 The overall aim of this research is to investigate the feasibility and appropriateness of the
43
44 establishment of the ASEAN-CBTS. A qualitative research approach is most suitable, due to
45
46 the complexity of the topic and the need to sieve through experiences, beliefs, attitudes and
47
48 behaviour of those with an expert view of the CBT sector.
49
50
51
52

53 From an epistemological perspective, this research adopted a constructionist approach
54
55 (Botterill & Platenkamp, 2012). This was most adequate to assess the social phenomenon of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 CBT and reflect upon the appropriateness of implementing CBTS in the ASEAN based on the
5
6 interpretation of ideas expressed by research participants. The research question derived from
7
8 a critical review of the literature on sustainable development, CBT, its role in ASEAN and the
9
10 evaluation of other TIS. Research respondents were selected on the basis of their specific
11
12 knowledge and expertise, which emerged also though the scrutiny of literature on the topic.
13
14 The qualitative assessment of their professional views (Smith, 2010; Botterill & Platenkamp,
15
16 2012) about CBTS in general and in the context of the ASEAN in particular was assessed
17
18 through the use of open-ended questions and a flexible approach in the questioning process,
19
20 which included follow-up and probing questions, and a dialogue (in English) that provided
21
22 detailed information. A list with questions and topics relevant to the research was used to
23
24 guide the interviews, however there was no set order of questions, which generally followed
25
26 the flow of the conversation and the interviewees' thinking process and reflections (Jennings,
27
28 2001). All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed. Thematic areas were derived in
29
30 relation to the research objectives (see table 4) and data was colour coded accordingly,
31
32 helping with the identification of patterns.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **INSERT Table 4: Research Objectives/Thematic areas vs. Secondary/Primary Research**
41
42
43

44 Based on the researchers' familiarity with the sustainable tourism research community
45
46 (Jennings, 2001), six key research participants were chosen for this study from a pool of
47
48 international and local experts, on the basis of their involvement in CBT in ASEAN and/or
49
50 their expertise in the field of STS and certification. Interviews took place between November
51
52 2014 and December 2014. Due to the limited availability of resources (time and budget) and
53
54 the extended geographical area in which research participants were based, interviews were
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 conducted via Skype (with video connection where possible), which emerged as sufficiently
5
6 adequate in providing a personal rapport between researcher and interviewee (Smith, 2010).
7
8
9

10 All participants were given written and verbal information about the research and the option
11 to withdraw at any point. They accepted the invitation to be interviewed and gave informed
12 verbal and recorded consent for the collection of data and recording of interviews.
13 Furthermore, issues of confidentiality, anonymity and privacy were considered, with research
14 participants being given the choice to remain anonymous. Although most had agreed to be
15 named in the final output emerging from the research, respondents were coded (RP1 to RP6 –
16 table 5) to enable a consistent anonymous responses' format.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **INSERT Table 5: Research Participants**

29
30
31
32

33 Respondents were also chosen in order to generate a complete picture on the research from
34 different perspectives, including CBT networks, industry experts and academics. In order to
35 avoid misinterpretation and misunderstandings research participants' direct quotes were sent
36 to participants for validation (Maxwell, 2005).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **4. Findings and Discussion**

45 **4.1 The ASEAN-CBTS**

46
47

48 One of the actions taken by the CBT-I to improve CBT was the CBTS handbook published in
49 2013, which includes a CBT-I Standards' checklist. Although this had been the result of
50 grass-root level consultations with over 60 Thai communities (RP3), who generally bought
51 into the idea of a CBTS, the Thai government had not yet endorsed them (Suansri and
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Yeejaw-haw, 2013). This, in turn, weakened the value and effectiveness of their
5
6 implementation. The CBT-I Standards' main intention was to foster local capacity and,
7
8 progressively enable communities to gain sufficient experience with the help of the self-
9
10 assessment CBTS' process, and possibly impact on their CBT performance (Suansri and
11
12 Yeejaw-haw, 2013). According to one of the interviewees, this self-assessment process can,
13
14 however, lead to biased results, therefore collaborations between communities, private sector
15
16 and NGOs was suggested as the only advisable way to better understand strengths and
17
18 weaknesses within the host communities (RP2). The gap between 'real CBT and fake CBT'
19
20 (RP6) and the need to improve CBT products and services remains a fundamental issue and
21
22 this type of CBTS engagement was regarded as a "planning, capacity building and self-
23
24 monitoring tool" (Suansri & Yeejaw-haw, 2013, p. 21), rather than a marketing one. As a
25
26 learning tool (RP2, RP3, RP5), it has enabled communities to 'identify areas, where they have
27
28 strengths and weaknesses, and then, depending on how much time and how many resources
29
30 they have and what the availability of people to assist them is, they can prioritise improving
31
32 specific areas' (RP3). Similarly, the ASEAN-CBTS is not ready to be a certification, if ever,
33
34 but should rather be used as an on-going process to facilitate capacity building (RP1, RP2,
35
36 RP3, RP6). It needs to consider the different environments and characteristics of the various
37
38 destinations and their communities, so that the criteria can be adjusted to changing
39
40 circumstances (Suansri & Yeejaw-haw, 2013), with flexibility and variations playing a key
41
42 role in their applicability in Thailand as much as in the rest of the ASEAN destinations (RP1,
43
44 RP3, RP4, RP6).

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 In November 2002, all ASEAN members signed the ASEAN Tourism Agreement with the
54
55 ultimate ambition to implement a network approach in the development of sustainable tourism
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 practices in South East Asia (ASEAN, 2014a). One of the objectives explicitly addresses the
5
6 development and implementation of STS. Since then, standards for green hotels, homestays,
7
8 ecotourism, public restrooms, clean tourist cities and ultimately community-based tourism
9
10 have been developed (ASEAN, 2014c), with the aim to enhance the quality of tourism
11
12 services, facilities and human resources all over ASEAN. Between 2007 and 2009, the
13
14 European Centre for Ecological and Agricultural Tourism (ECEAT) implemented a project
15
16 called 'Communities in International Business, Common quality standards and marketing for
17
18 Community Based Tourism Businesses in Asia' (ECEAT, n.d.). Supporting CBT networks in
19
20 Indonesia, Mongolia and Cambodia, the aim was to develop a common set of industry
21
22 standards, investigate and enhance the tourism supply-chain and promote CBT. Cambodia
23
24 was chosen as the host country to implement the CBTS, based on funding from the EU Asia-
25
26 Invest initiative, with the objective of promoting and supporting business cooperation
27
28 between Europe and Asia (GFWW, 2006). Thereupon, CCBEN developed a set of CBTS and
29
30 with support from the Cambodian government who unilaterally published them as the CBTS
31
32 for ASEAN. However, these CBTS have not been endorsed by ASEAN nor officially adopted
33
34 by any other destination.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The current ASEAN-CBTS consists of 8 criteria (table 6) subdivided into 23 sub-criteria,
43
44 which consist of a total of 171 performance indicators, categorized as 'Minimum
45
46 Requirements', 'Advanced Requirements' and 'Best Practice Requirements' (Carter, 2014).
47
48 Communities can reach different levels of performance and achieve scores for all applicable
49
50 requirements according to a self-assessment form. As an outcome of the evaluation, CBT
51
52 operations can reach a 'Registration' (complies with 60% of the minimum requirements),
53
54 'Endorsement' (complies with 80% of the minimum and 60% of the advanced requirements)
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 or ‘Certification’ (complies with 100% of the minimum and 80% of the advanced
5 requirements) stage (RP3).
6
7
8
9

10
11 **INSERT Table 6: ASEAN-CBTS Criteria (Source: Adapted from Carter, 2014).**
12

13
14
15 The self-assessment has to be supported by evidence, such as reports, signed codes-of-
16 conduct, photographic proof, data from observations and interviews with CBT groups,
17 customers and tour operators. The communities are supported with standard handbooks,
18 checklists, codes-of-conduct and community audit workbooks, with the main objective of
19 identifying areas of improvement and enable identification of opportunities for strategic
20 interventions and capacity building (Carter, 2014). The self-assessment was devised as a
21 sustainable tourism planning tool, and is likely to remain the main if not the only achievable
22 objective, given the diversity of those involved and the complex political environment (RP2,
23 RP4, RP6).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **4.2 The Role of Key Stakeholders in CBTS**
38

39 **4.2.1 Governments**
40

41
42 The ASEAN ‘Framework Agreement on Services’ identifies tourism as one of the main
43 sectors for “regional economic collaboration” (Wong, Mistilis & Dwyer, 2011a, p. 885), with
44 all ASEAN member states sharing an interest in promoting stability, predictability and
45 reliability of the tourism industry within South East Asia. The involvement of governments in
46 the development and implementation of the ASEAN-CBTS is strategically important (Font &
47 Bendell, 2002; Bendell & Font, 2004). However, an evident disconnect exists between policy
48 and implementation. While ASEAN tourism objectives fall under the general ASEAN
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 economic cooperation framework, which means that tourism policies are defined at economic
5
6 ministries' level, the implementation process remains in the hands of national tourism
7
8 ministries. One of the main success factors for tourism development is the political will and
9
10 support from governments and leaders and their role as advisors and coordinators (Wong et
11
12 al., 2011). While national institutions (i.e. Ministries of Tourism) may represent the most
13
14 appropriate 'home' for CBTS (RP2, RP4, RP5, RP6), and guarantee long term sustainability
15
16 (RP6), in a region where numerous NGOs engage in project-based ventures with limited time
17
18 and budgets, a main constraining factor in CBTS' implementation is the lack of governance
19
20 continuity. For example, since the end of the project through which CCBEN and the
21
22 Cambodian government drafted the ASEAN-CBTS, neither a follow-up nor a coordinated
23
24 push for the endorsement and launch of the CBTS in ASEAN has taken place (RP5).
25
26 Contrasting views on the ASEAN-CBTS governance model have therefore emerged. A
27
28 number of participants viewed governments as 'facilitators best placed to establish an
29
30 enabling environment in which CBTS can be introduced and implemented' (RP2), others
31
32 regarded governments as mere 'host organisations' (RP6) or 'the entities responsible for the
33
34 final evaluation' (RP5). The feasibility of the Thai CBT-I Standards model, whereby the
35
36 government finances the homestay standard and employs external (third party) auditors (RP3)
37
38 was generally dismissed as feasible option as a government-financed evaluation process
39
40 across ASEAN would be unaffordable due to the widespread lack of funding that affects the
41
42 tourism sector in the region (RP1).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In addition to the diverse regional cultural context, further challenges to the effective
52
53 implementation of tourism policies exist. These include the lack of political, the recurrent
54
55 change of governments, tourism ministers and NTOs, the generally slow public policy
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 development and implementation process and the limited coordination and communication
5 among government agencies (Wong et al., 2011b). This is even more so the case in the
6 context of the ASEAN tourism industry, where policy development and implementation
7 depends upon the collaboration of several government bodies, such as ministries of tourism,
8 immigration, transportation, aviation, national parks, international trade and forestry
9 departments (Wong et al, 2011b). The complex multi-stakeholder approach required, the lack
10 of understanding of the needs of the tourism industry and the consequent disengaged
11 approach of some institutions threaten the effective implementation of any tourism project,
12 including the CBTS (RP2).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 25 26 **4.2.2 Communities** 27

28 The involvement and participation of community grass-roots members in CBT are a well-
29 traversed topic (Leksakundilok & Hirsch, 2008; Rocharungsat, 2008). As one of the
30 respondents states, 'when we're talking about Community Based Tourism, of course, it's
31 absolutely fundamental that communities are involved in the development of the standards'
32 (RP3). Community consultations are a critical component in the success of CBTS, as they
33 need to reflect communities' perspective, needs and wishes (RP4). However, the inconsistent
34 and often incompressible set of information by organisations providing technical assistance
35 has often created confusion about the standards, their implementation and evaluation (RP1,
36 RP6). This highlights the need for a coordinated action (RP6) and clear guidelines on the
37 CBTS' process for inclusion (RP4), otherwise there is the potential of misunderstandings
38 leading to conflict (Reid, et al., 2004; Stoeckl, 2008). Most 'standards are very top-down' and
39 take little notice of local CBT organisations and the actual end-users' views (RP1). Evidence
40 of consultations taking place with already well-developed CBT organisation, rather than those
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 requiring improvement of their practice, has often led to potential misjudgement of the real
5 needs on the ground (RP1). In Indonesia for example, standards developed by outside
6 consultants and government officials resulted in inconsistent recommendations that are
7 completely disassociated with local realities and characterised by a misrepresentation of local
8 community views and needs (RP4). This, in turn, widens the implementation gap and poses
9 questions over the appropriateness of such practices.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **4.2.3 Other Stakeholders**

21
22 The multi-stakeholder approach adopted by CBT-I, CCBEN and INDECON can be seen as a
23 model of good practice. The approach includes governments, civil societies, communities, the
24 private sector and tourists involved in the planning and development of the various CBTS,
25 feeding into the ASEAN-CBTS. Nevertheless, the implementation of a cohesive and unified
26 ASEAN-CBTS remains challenged by different practices widely used in each country. For
27 instance, whereas INDECON's CBT checklist is used merely in Indonesia (RP4), the CBT-I
28 Standards are applied in Thailand only (RP6). The literature has evidenced how NGOs have
29 supported CBT (Ko, 2001; Rocharungsat, 2008) and respondents noted how NGO's have
30 provided training and skills development initiatives (RP1, RP2, RP6). However, a better-
31 coordinated and collaborative approach between those operating in the region (i.e. while
32 DASTA is using the ASEAN-CBTS, CBT-I uses its own criteria) is needed to harmonise
33 CBTS' practices and implement the ASEAN-CBTS more cohesively and widely (RP6).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In addition to this, given the role of the private sector (i.e. tour operators, tourism associations
52 and travel agents) and tourists in the success of CBT (RP1), as they participate in the
53 development, implementation and consumption of it, their active engagement in the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 evaluation stage of CBTS was suggested as an option (RP6). Notwithstanding, that the lack of
5
6 knowledge about their target market can result in misunderstandings and tourists' negative
7
8 experiences of the CBT product (Pearce, et al., 1996; Hall, 2005; Leksakundilok & Hirsch,
9
10 2008; Stoeckl, 2008), what is often ignored is that local communities do not intuitively
11
12 understand tourists' needs, requirements and expectations, having no or very limited
13
14 experience about the sector. The situation is similar in terms of communities' understanding
15
16 of CBTS, which needs to be firstly mapped against a fully understood CBT product offering
17
18 and then implemented as part of a clearly communicated collaborative strategy between key
19
20 stakeholders (RP3).
21
22
23

24
25
26 Within ASEAN, tourism policies are developed and adopted with a pragmatic, necessity-
27
28 driven approach, but a lack of "industry-specific procedural rules as well as monitoring and
29
30 enforcement mechanisms" (Wong et al., 2011a, p. 894) weakens their effective
31
32 implementation. In principle, the registration and endorsement of the ASEAN-CBTS is a
33
34 process in the hands of CBT administering authorities, whereas the certification is meant to be
35
36 undertaken by a national tourism organisation (Carter, 2014). However, reservations about
37
38 stakeholders' roles and responsibilities about each stage of the ASEAN-CBTS emerged (RP3,
39
40 RP5), in particular in relation to who should deal with the evaluation and monitoring process
41
42 and defray the costs of CBTS (RP2).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.3 ASEAN-CBTS: Challenges, Opportunities and Operational Issues

4.3.1 Challenges

As previously mentioned, funding constitutes a major limitation to the general development of tourism in ASEAN destinations and the implementation of a common CBTS. ASEAN tourism is mainly funded by the member states and is based on an equal contribution principle, which means that all member states are supposed to contribute the same amount of money for ASEAN tourism projects and activities (Wong et al., 2011b). However, in reality, the amount of contribution is calculated according to the amount that less-developed countries are able or willing to contribute. Even though government, with support from IDAs, may have disbursed funds in the planning phase of the ASEAN-CBTS, many countries within ASEAN appeared to have limited their funding or even withdrawn their financial support in the implementation phase (RP5).

The lack of sufficient financial resources presents a major hindering factor in the implementation of tourism projects and policies (Wong, et al., 2011b; Suansri & Yeejaw-haw, 2013), with CBT generally depending on financial support from outside donor organisations, (RP3). As CBTS depends upon three stages - development, implementation and evaluation, in order to be effective, adequate funding is required for each phase. Organisations, such as ECEAT, or tourism associations and IDAs have indeed played a fundamental role in funding the development stage of the ASEAN-CBTS (RP6), but, according to respondents RP4 and RP5, national governments should take responsibility for funding its implementation stage. Self-assessment forms represent an inexpensive method to implement the ASEAN-CBTS' evaluation stage, by being in the hands of each CBT operator, eventually seeking an external certification, if they wish to do so. Non-direct business-to-business financing schemes would

1
2
3
4 be the most appropriate and most transparent way to evaluate and monitor CBTS within
5 ASEAN (RP2). However, some rejected the proposition of a business-to-business approach,
6 as in the case of relatively poor communities ‘the increased cost of capacity building, plus
7 then quality insurance to meet those standards will by far exceed the increased revenue CBT
8 are going to get’ (RP1). The view that a ‘non business-to-business CBTS approach’ may
9 further perpetuate a donors’ dependency cycle may be strengthened by the fact that those
10 CBT projects that are unable to finance the evaluation of their own operation due to limited
11 profitability may not only limit the full implementation CBTS within their operation, but may
12 raise fundamental questions about their long-term sustainability.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 What is more is that the political culture within ASEAN follows consensus-seeking and all-
27 equal principles, impacting upon the success of tourism collaboration and the effective
28 implementation of any CBTS (Wong et al., 2011a). Such principle can constrain the success
29 of certain projects by simply requiring that benefits be generated for all ASEAN members
30 (Wong et al., 2011a). However, within ASEAN, member states vary in size, economic power
31 and stages of economic development, so an equal collaboration and progress in tourism
32 development is in itself difficult if not impossible. Such differences are known to potentially
33 create social-economic division, which in turn may negatively affect collaboration (Johnson
34 & Wilson, 2000; Smith & Duffy, 2003; Reid, et al., 2004). Thailand and Indonesia, for
35 example, are evidently more experienced and more advanced in the development of CBT
36 products, whereas Laos, Myanmar or Vietnam remain relatively new to the concept (RP4).
37 Such differences pose fundamental operational challenges in the way CBTS should be
38 implemented as ‘if you use a low benchmark, then it will be a downgrading for the Thailand
39 users. But if you put a very, very high standard, then it will be very difficult for our friends in,
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 for example, Laos to catch up' (RP4). Each country and each village within ASEAN shows
5
6 great differences in terms of landscape, culture, development progress and environment and
7
8 as one of the respondents put it, 'I cannot imagine how to impose one common standard
9
10 within Indonesia, let alone for ASEAN' (RP4). While such diversity between different
11
12 countries and communities can get lost with the introduction of one common CBTS (RP1,
13
14 RP2, RP4), by 'tak[ing] authenticity and uniqueness away' (RP2), tourists are looking for
15
16 seamless experiences as "[t]hey want a localised experience, but in a globalised world.'
17
18 (RP1). They wish to experience products and services which are comparable in terms of
19
20 quality (RP4), without taking away from the unique character of the location in which they
21
22 are offered. This does not mean that 'you can't have a bamboo house, it just says your roof
23
24 on your bamboo house shouldn't leak' (RP3).
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 **4.3.2 Opportunities and Operational Issues**

32
33 Notwithstanding the recognised challenges associated with the implementation of the
34
35 ASEAN-CBTS, the support that they can provide to communities in dealing with the growing
36
37 CBT demand is obvious. It is suggested that, as a planning rather than a certification tool,
38
39 ASEAN-CBTS will impact positively on improving CBT in the region, by identifying
40
41 strengths and weaknesses of CBT communities (RP3), by facilitating ad-hoc capacity building
42
43 initiatives as well as by sharing good practices amongst ASEAN destinations (RP1, RP3).
44
45 Communities would become stronger and better organised, which will prevent them from
46
47 being exploited by tour operators and visitors (RP2). ASEAN-CBTS could also be used as a
48
49 tool to improve management skills and introduce sustainable management systems (RP3,
50
51 RP5, RP6). The aspect of management is in fact the very first performance criterion of the
52
53 ASEAN-CBTS (Carter, 2014). Given that the actual effect of standards on securing better
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 market shares is not guaranteed (Francis & Goodwin, 2009; Jarvis, et al., 2010), ASEAN-
5
6 CBTS would work as a ‘partnership tool’, facilitating collaborations, for example between
7
8 CBT and tour operators, indirectly tapping on marketing opportunities (RP3) offered by a
9
10 better understood visitors’ market. The ASEAN-CBTS would eventually create more trust
11
12 between tour operators, tourists and communities by providing certainty and clarity about the
13
14 CBT product, its appeal and impacts (RP4).
15
16
17
18
19

20 Contemporary tourists place much importance and trust in word-of-mouth reviews and
21
22 platforms, such as TripAdvisor, rather than official tourism standards and accreditations:
23

24 *We are moving towards a system, where authority based systems are not really*
25
26 *trusted by customers anymore. They are not particularly market relevant or*
27
28 *flexible.* (RP1)
29

30 Therefore, the opinion of past visitors may become far more crucial than that of a certification
31
32 process, having a considerable value in marketing and promotion terms. By simply being
33
34 enabled to better understand, plan, manage and deliver their CBT offering, communities
35
36 would improve their operations, positively influence tourists’ perceptions and experiences and
37
38 potentially attract more customers (RP2, RP3, RP4, RP6).
39
40
41
42

43
44 Throughout the research, it became clear that the introduction of an external evaluation
45
46 system was premature. Hence, a feedback system whereby communities, tour operators and
47
48 tourists could share opinions about requirements and experiences could potentially assist in
49
50 generating a transparent evaluation (RP1) of ‘what really happens in CBT’ (RP2), rather than
51
52 imposing pre-constituted parameters, which may not be achievable. It was suggested that,
53
54 simple minimum standards or common principles may help set a clearer list of achievable
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 parameters for communities to be guided through the process of standardisation (RP3, RP4).
5
6 Instead of only focusing just on services and quality of products, the ASEAN-CBTS needed
7
8 to address sustainable management practices, cultural and environmental benefits and the fair
9
10 distribution of income (RP6) as fundamental characteristics of the sustainable tourism
11
12 business model. CBTS must become embedded within CBT practices at national level first,
13
14 with minimum parameters helping CBT improve and develop further (RP3) rather than being
15
16 a top down imposed one. Evidence from Thailand, Indonesia and Cambodia suggests that
17
18 working at national level first is the most appropriate way forward (RP2, RP3, RP4, RP5,
19
20 RP6). An advanced ASEAN-CBTS could be an option for the future (RP3), and although
21
22 most respondents agreed in principle that ASEAN-CBTS is necessary as a planning tool, it is
23
24 yet premature to assume that it would work in such a complex socio-economic setting.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Conclusions**

32
33 This paper has explored the appropriateness of the ASEAN-CBTS certification and more
34
35 specifically key challenges and opportunities associated with its implementation. Framed by a
36
37 critical overview of CBT and CBTS, the paper discussed how ASEAN's aspirations of
38
39 leveraging the ASEAN-CBTS as a planning tool to support and promote sustainable forms of
40
41 CBT in the region is challenged by the complexities of a multifaceted political situation,
42
43 diverse cultural settings, weak institutions and governance in areas such as tourism planning,
44
45 human resources, capacity and funding.
46
47
48
49

50
51 Yet, despite these challenges, it was suggested that a collaborative multi-stakeholders'
52
53 approach harmonising national CBTS practices would accelerate the implementation of the
54
55 ASEAN-CBTS in the region. In fact, as evidenced in the case of CBT-I, CCBEN and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 INDECON a multi-stakeholder approach in the planning and implementation of national
5
6 CBTS worked with the self-assessment process providing a good starting point to evaluate
7
8 CBT strengths and weaknesses and serving as an effective planning tool. Although, CBT
9
10 generally remains dependent upon IDAs and NGOs' financial and technical support, in order
11
12 for CBT to become a self-reliant and sustainable sector, a collaborative business model would
13
14 be useful. This would mean that CBTS are endorsed by national governments and embedded
15
16 in local business practices to become firmly established as a good practice in the tourism
17
18 industry.
19
20
21
22
23

24 Slow political process, fast shifting governing bodies and limited funding have hindered the
25
26 effective implementation of the CBTS and weakened collaboration prospects and effective
27
28 communication between the various CBTS-ASEAN actors (i.e. political bodies, private sector
29
30 operators, IDAs and civil societies). While the ASEAN-CBTS development stage had been
31
32 widely supported by IDAs and NGOs, it was suggested that the implementation stage should
33
34 be in the hands of national government, with the private sector taking responsibility for the
35
36 evaluation component stage.
37
38
39
40
41

42 The proposed staged implementation of the ASEAN-CBTS and a self-assessed minimum
43
44 standards' approach, whereby all must comply with a set of minimum requirements was
45
46 indeed useful, as communities in ASEAN could use a building-block approach in the gradual
47
48 achievement of key CBTS and, once they are ready, move to the next levels (i.e. 'advanced'
49
50 and 'best practice'). However, the facilitation of basic entrepreneurial, leadership and sector-
51
52 specific technical capacity-building activities remain fundamental if communities are to shift
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 from a development project mentality and aid dependent practice to a profitable business one,
5
6 which is needed to deliver a competitive CBT product.
7
8
9

10 The ASEAN-CBTS represent an extremely useful and necessary tool to build communities'
11 capacity and improve CBT products, services and management practices. However, the
12 necessity of implementing CBTS at national level is a fundamental step that can no longer be
13 ignored. It is likely to take some time before the ASEAN-CBTS will achieve its aspiration of
14 becoming a fully implemented transnational certification programme – and we do not yet
15 know whether this will ever be possible at all. Nevertheless, shifting ASEAN-CBTS' core
16 focus from an aspirational to the pragmatic approach as a planning and development tool
17 rather than an evaluating one is both realistic and useful, given the complexity of CBT in
18 general and the geographical setting in which the ASEAN-CBTS is meant to operate.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 If CBTS are to contribute to the sustainable growth of CBT and ultimately to the socio-
34 economic wellbeing of remote rural areas, they will need to emerge from a harmonized set of
35 CBT guidelines, which, at the same time, acknowledge local differences. The appropriateness
36 and feasibility of CBTS remain an under researched topic and yet, in addition to holding
37 much potential, remain susceptible to the risks of a 'one fits' all measure. It becomes
38 increasingly obvious that CBTS emerge out of the need to address wider problems such as the
39 lack of understanding of CBT's complexity and the growing desire to address rural poverty
40 through CBT increasingly challenged by the unsustainable nature of certain CBT practices.
41 Tackling these issues first through creating a more widespread understanding of CBT
42 competitiveness and service delivery therefore needs to be the utmost priority before engaging
43 in cross-country CBT benchmarking, standardization and certification.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

References

- Aref, F. (2011). Barriers to community capacity building for tourism development in communities in Shiraz, Iran. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(3), 347–359.
- ASEAN (2014). Overview. Retrieved from <http://www.asean.org/asean/about-asean>
- ASEAN Secretariat (2014a). ASEAN tourism agreement. Retrieved from <http://www.asean.org/news/item/asean-tourism-agreement>
- ASEAN Secretariat (2014b). ASEAN tourism ministers meeting (M-ATM). Retrieved from <http://www.asean.org/communities/asean-economic-community/category/asean-tourism-ministers-meeting-m-atm>
- Baker, S., Kousis, M., Richardson, D., & Young, S. (1997). Introduction: The theory and practice of sustainable development in EU perspective. In S. Baker, M. Kousis, D. Richardson, & S. Young (Eds.), *The politics of sustainable development* (pp. 1-42). London: Routledge.
- Beckett, R., & Jonker, J. (2002). AccountAbility 1000: A new social standard for building sustainability. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 17(5), 36-42.
- Bendell, J., & Font, X. (2004). Which tourism rules? Green standards and GATS. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(1), 139–156.
- Botterill, D., & Platenkamp, V. (2012). *Key concepts in tourism research*. London: Sage.
- Carter, B. (2014). International conference on community development through tourism [Power Point presentation]. Retrieved from <http://sustain.pata.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/RW-Bill-Carter-ASEAN-CBT-Standard.pdf>
- Diamantis, D., & Westlake, J. (2001). Ecolabeling in the context of sustainable tourism and ecotourism. In X. Font, & R. C. Buckley (Eds.), *Tourism ecolabelling: Certification and promotion of sustainable management* (pp. 27-40). Wallingford: CABI.
- Dolezal, C. (2015a). *Questioning empowerment in community-based tourism in rural Bali*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Brighton, UK.
- Dolezal, C. (2015b). The tourism encounter in community-based tourism in Northern Thailand: Empty meeting ground or space for change? *ASEAS – Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies*, 8(2), 165-186.
- Dolezal, C., & Trupp, A. (2015). Tourism and development in Southeast Asia. *ASEAS – Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies*, 8(2), 117-124.
- Dowling, R. K. (2000). Ecotourism in Southeast Asia: A golden opportunity for local communities. In K. S. Chon (Ed.), *Tourism in Southeast Asia: A new direction* (pp. 1-20). Binghamton: The Haworth Press.
- ECEAT (n.d.). Promotion of sustainable tourism products. Retrieved from <http://www.eceat-projects.org/html/promotion.html>

- 1
2
3
4 Erskine, L.M., & Meyer, D. (2012). Influenced and influential: the role of tour operators and
5 development organisations in tourism and poverty reduction in Ecuador. *Journal of*
6 *Sustainable Tourism*, 20(3), 339-357
7
- 8 Font, X. (2001). Regulating the green message: The players in ecolabelling. In X. Font, & R.
9 C. Buckley (Eds.), *Tourism ecolabelling: Certification and promotion of sustainable*
10 *management* (pp. 1-17). Wallingford: CABI.
11
- 12 Font, X. (2002a). Environmental certification in tourism and hospitality: Progress, process
13 and prospects. *Tourism Management*, 23(3), 197–205.
14
- 15 Font, X. (2002b). Certification systems and standards in tourism. *Annals of Tourism*
16 *Research*, 29(3), 869–870.
17
- 18 Font, X., & Bendell, J. (2002). *Standards for sustainable tourism for the purpose of*
19 *multilateral trade negotiations*. Leeds: WTO.
20
- 21 Font, X., & Harris, C. (2004). Rethinking standards from green to sustainable. *Annals of*
22 *Tourism Research*, 31(4), 986–1007.
23
- 24 Francis, J., & Goodwin, H. (2009). Open letter and petition on the Global Sustainable
25 Tourism Criteria. Retrieved from [http://www.responsibletravel.com/copy/open-letter-and-](http://www.responsibletravel.com/copy/open-letter-and-petition-on-the-global-sustainable-tourism-criteria)
26 [petition-on-the-global-sustainable-tourism-criteria](http://www.responsibletravel.com/copy/open-letter-and-petition-on-the-global-sustainable-tourism-criteria)
27
- 28 GFWW. (2006). Welcome on pages of the Asia Invest Project SELECT-IT. Retrieved from
29 <http://www.asia-invest.de/select-it/index.html>
30
- 31 Goessling, S., Hall, M. C., & Weaver, D. B. (2009). Sustainable tourism futures: Perspectives
32 on systems, restructuring and innovations. In S. Goessling, M. C. Hall, & D. B. Weaver
33 (Eds.), *Sustainable Tourism Futures* (pp. 1-18). New York: Routledge.
34
- 35 Goodwin, H., & Santilli, R. (2009). Community-based tourism: A success? *ICRT Occasional*
36 *Paper No. 11*. International Centre for Responsible Tourism. Retrieved from
37 <http://www.haroldgoodwin.info/uploads/CBTaSuccessPubpdf.pdf>
38
- 39 Green Globe Certification (2014a). Green Globe Certification. Retrieved from
40 <http://greenglobe.com/about/>
41
- 42 Green Globe Certification (2014b). About Green Globe. Retrieved from
43 <http://greenglobe.com/about/>
44
- 45 Green Globe Certification (2014c). Standard Criteria and Indicators. Retrieved from
46 <http://greenglobe.com/standard/>
47
- 48 Griffin, T., & De Lacy, T. (2002). Green Globe: Sustainability accreditation for tourism. In P.
49 Williams, T. Griffin, & R. Harris (Eds.), *Sustainable tourism: A global perspective* (pp. 58-
50 88). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
51
- 52 GSTC. (2013a). Global sustainable tourism council criteria and suggested performance
53 indicators for hotels and tour operators. Retrieved from
54 http://www.gstccouncil.org/images/pdf/HTO-CRITERIA_and_INDICATORS_6-9-14.pdf
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 GSTC. (2013b). Global sustainable tourism council criteria and suggested performance
5 indicators for destinations. Retrieved from <http://www.gstcouncil.org/images/Dest->
6 [_CRITERIA_and_INDICATORS_6-9-14.pdf](http://www.gstcouncil.org/images/Dest-)
7
- 8 GSTC. (2014). Welcome to sustainable tourism. Retrieved from
9 <http://www.gstcouncil.org/about/learn-about-gstc.html>
10
- 11 Hall, C. M. (2005). *Tourism: Rethinking the social science of mobility*. Harlow: Pearson.
- 12
13 Jarvis, N., Weeden, C., & Simcock, N. (2010). The benefits and challenges of sustainable
14 tourism certification: A case study of the Green Tourism Scheme in the west of England.
15 *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 17(1), 83-93.
16
- 17 Jennings, G. (2001). *Tourism research*. Milton: John Wiley & Sons Australia.
- 18
19 Johnson, H., & Wilson, G. (2000). Biting the bullet: Civil society, social learning and the
20 transformation of local governance. *World Development*, 28(11), 1891-1906.
21
- 22 Ko, J. T. (2001). Assessing progress of tourism sustainability. *Annals of Tourism Research*,
23 28(3), 817-820.
24
- 25 Landthaler, M. (2014). Fostering sustainability in tourism. *International Trade Forum*, 1(1),
26 34-35.
27
- 28 Le, T-A., Weaver, D., & Lawton, L. (2012). 'Factors influencing the performance of
29 community- based tourism in the semi-periphery of Vietnam: A resident perspective from Ta
30 Van Village'. *The new golden age of tourism and hospitality* CAUTHE, Council for
31 Australian University Tourism and Hospitality Education, Melbourne Convention and
32 Exhibition Centre, Proceedings Book 2: 361–365.
33
- 34 Leksakundilok, A., & Hirsch, P. (2008). Community-based ecotourism in Thailand. In J.
35 Connell, & B. Rugendyke (Eds.), *Tourism at the grassroots: Villagers and visitors in the*
36 *Asia-Pacific* (pp. 214-235). Abingdon: Routledge.
37
- 38 Li, Y. (2004). Exploring community tourism in China: The case of Nanshan Cultural Tourism
39 Zone. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12(3), 175-193.
40
- 41 Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.).
42 London: Sage.
43
- 44 Mitchell, R. E., & Eagles, P. F. (2010). An integrative approach to tourism: Lessons from the
45 Andes in Peru. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 9(1), 4-28.
46
- 47 Moscardo, G. (2008). Community capacity building: An emerging challenge for tourism
48 development. In G. Moscardo (Ed.), *Building community capacity for tourism development*
49 (pp. 1-15). Wallingford: CABI.
50
- 51 Murphy, P.E. (1983). Tourism as a community industry: An ecological model of tourism
52 development. *Tourism Management*, 4(3), 180-193.
53
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Murphy, P.E. (1988). Community driven tourism planning, *Tourism Management*, 9(2), 96-
5 104.
6
7 Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2014). Towards a comprehensive model of community-
8 based tourism development. *South African Geographical Journal*, 98(1), 154-168.
9
10 Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2013). Interrogating the role of the state and non-state actors
11 in community-based tourism ventures: Toward a model for spreading the benefits. *South*
12 *African Geographical Journal*, 95(1), 1-15.
13
14 Novelli, M. (2016). *Tourism and development in Sub-Saharan Africa: Contemporary issues*
15 *and local realities*. Oxford: Routledge.
16
17 Novelli, M., & Gebhardt, K. (2007). Community based tourism in Namibia: ‘Reality show’ or
18 ‘window dressing’? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(5), 1-37.
19
20 PATA. (2014). About PATA sustainability & social responsibility. Retrieved from
21 <http://sustain.pata.org/about/about-pata-sustainability-social-responsibility/>
22
23 Pearce, P. L., Moscardo, G., & Ross, G. F. (1996). *Tourism community relationships*. Oxford:
24 Pergamon Press.
25
26 Pridham, G., & Konstadakopulos, D. (1997). Sustainable development in Mediterranean
27 Europe? Interactions between European, national and sub-national levels. In S. Baker, M.
28 Kousis, D. Richardson, & S. Young (Eds.), *The Politics of Sustainable Development* (pp. 127-
29 151). London: Routledge.
30
31 Reid, D. G., Mair, H., & George, W. (2004). Community tourism planning: A self-assessment
32 instrument. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 623-639.
33
34 Rocharungsat, P. (2008). Community-based tourism in Asia. In G. Moscardo (Ed.), *Building*
35 *Community Capacity for Tourism Development* (pp. 60-74). Wallingford: CABI.
36
37 Scheyvens, R. (2002). *Tourism for development empowering community*. Harlow: Prentice
38 Hall.
39
40 Self, R. M., Self, D. R., & Bell-Haynes, J. (2010). Marketing tourism in the Galapagos
41 Islands: Ecotourism or greenwashing? *International Business and Economics Research*
42 *Journal*, 9(6), 111-125.
43
44 Smith, M., & Duffy, R. (2003). *The ethics of tourism development*. London: Routledge.
45
46 Smith, S. L. (2010). *Practical tourism research*. Wallingford: Cabi.
47
48 Snyman, S. (2012a). Ecotourism joint ventures between the private sector and communities:
49 An updated analysis of the Torra Conservancy and Damaraland Camp partnership, Namibia.
50 *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 4, 127-135.
51
52 Snyman, S. (2012b). The role of ecotourism employment in poverty reduction and community
53 perceptions of conservation and tourism in southern Africa. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*,
54 20(3), 395-416.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Son, N. T., Pigram, J. J., & Rugendyke, B. A. (1999). Tourism development and national
5 parks in developing world: Cat Ba Island National Park, Vietnam. In G. P. Douglas, & R. W.
6 Butler (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Tourism Development* (pp. 211-231). London:
7 Routledge.

8
9
10 Stoeckl, N. (2008). Enhancing the economic benefits of tourism at the local level. In G.
11 Moscardo (Ed.), *Building Community Capacity for Tourism Development* (pp. 16-28).
12 Wallingford: CABI.

13
14 Strambach, S., & Surmeier, A. (2013). Knowledge dynamics in setting sustainable standards
15 in tourism – the case of 'Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa'. *Current Issues in Tourism*,
16 *16*(7-8), 736-752.

17
18 Suansri, P. (2013). Introduction. In J. Hummel, H. de Jong, & K. Dhiradityakul (Eds.),
19 *Innovating CBT in ASEAN: Current directions and new horizons* (pp. 1-4). Chiang Mai:
20 CBT-I.

21
22 Suansri, P., & Richards, P. (2009). *Local Insight: Thai community based tourism*. Chiang
23 Mai: The Tourism Authority of Thailand.

24
25 Suansri, P., & Yeejaw-haw, S. (2013). *CBT standard handbook*. Chiang Mai: CBT-I.

26
27 Walker, J., Mitchell, B., & Wismer, S. (2001). Livelihood strategy approach to community-
28 based planning and assessment: A case study of Molas, Indonesia. *Impact Assessment and*
29 *Project Appraisal*, *19*(4), 297-309.

30
31 Walker, K. (2008). Linking a sense of place with a sense of care: Overcoming sustainability
32 challenges faced by remote island communities. In G. Moscardo (Ed.), *Building community*
33 *capacity for tourism Development* (pp. 41-59). Wallingford: CABI.

34
35 WCED. (1987). *Our common future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and*
36 *Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

37
38 Wearing, S., & McDonald, M. (2002). The development of community-based tourism: Re-
39 thinking the relationship between tour operators and development agents as intermediaries in
40 rural and isolated area communities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *10* (3), 191-206.

41
42 Weaver, D. (2006). *Sustainable tourism: Theory and practice*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-
43 Heinemann.

44
45 Wong, E. P., Mistilis, N., & Dwyer, L. (2011a). A model of ASEAN collaboration in tourism.
46 *Annals of Tourism Research*, *38* (3), 882-899.

47
48 Wong, E. P., Mistilis, N., & Dwyer, L. (2011b). A framework for analyzing
49 intergovernmental collaboration: The case of ASEAN tourism. *Tourism Management*, *32*,
50 367-376.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (Source: Adapted from GSTC, 2013a, 2013b)

Hotels and tour operators	
Section A:	Demonstrate effective sustainable management
Section B:	Maximise social and economic benefits to the local community and minimise negative impacts
Section C:	Maximise benefits to cultural heritage and minimise negative impacts
Section D:	Maximise benefits to the environment and minimise negative impacts
Destinations (GSTC, 2013b)	
Section A:	Demonstrate sustainable destination management
Section B:	Maximize social and economic benefits for the host community and minimize negative impacts
Section C:	Maximize benefits to communities, visitors and cultural heritage and minimize negative impacts
Section D:	Maximize benefits to the environment and minimize negative impacts

Table 2: The Green Globe Certification Criteria (Green Globe Certification, 2014c)

Criteria	Indicators
A. Sustainable Management	A.1 Implement a Sustainable Management System A.2 Legal Compliance A.3 Employee Training A.4 Customer Satisfaction A.5 Accuracy of Promotional Materials A.6 Local Zoning, Design and Construction A.7 Interpretation A.8 Communications Strategy A.9 Health and Safety
B. Social/Economic	B.1 Community Development B.2 Local Employment B.3 Fair Trade B.4 Support Local Entrepreneurs B.5 Respect Local Communities B.6 Exploitation B.7 Equitable Hiring B.8 Employee Protection B.9 Basic Services
C. Cultural Heritage	C.1 Code of Behavior C.2 Historical Artifacts C.3 Protection of Sites C.4 Incorporation of Culture
D. Environmental	D.1 Conserving Resources D.2 Reducing Pollution D.3 Conserving Biodiversity, Ecosystems, and Landscapes

Table 3: The Thai CBT-I Standards (Source: Adapted from Suansri and Yeejaw-haw, 2013)

Criteria
i. Sustainable Tourism Management for Community Based Tourism
ii. CBT distributes benefits broadly to the local area and society and improves quality of life
iii. CBT celebrates, conserves and supports cultural heritage
iv. Systematic, sustainable natural resource and environmental management
v. CBT service and safety

For Peer Review Only

Table 4: Research Objectives/Thematic areas vs. Secondary/Primary Research

Research Objective	Relevant Literature	Primary Research	Interview Question
CBT development in ASEAN and the CBT Standard Draft	Principles of sustainable tourism. CBT as growing market in ASEAN. Lack of academic lit. on CBT standards	CBT standard implemented, not officially endorsed. Community involvement. Capacity building and self-monitoring tool.	Are the communities in Thailand already working with the CBT standard?
CBT standard development in ASEAN	ASEAN collaboration in tourism. Standard funded by ECEAT. CBT principles. 8 criteria groups	CBT standard developed, not yet endorsed. Collaboration CCBEN, Cambodia and ASEAN	Is there a common CBT understanding within ASEAN? Are the communities already working with a standard?
Stakeholders	Political collaboration within ASEAN. Government involvement advisable. Community involvement necessary. NGOs	Government as main stakeholder. Stakeholder mix: government, communities, private sector, tourists. Challenges	Who are the main stakeholders when developing/ implementing/ evaluating a CBT standard? Involvement of the government?
Challenges	Funding. Political culture. Impact on marketing value not proven.	Funding. Stages of development. Standardisation. Impact on marketing value?	What are the main limitations when developing/ implementing/ evaluating CBT standard?
Benefits	Identifying strengths, weaknesses, gaps.	Identifying strengths, weaknesses, gaps. Discussion between communities and private sector. Community becomes organised and strong. Quality of CBT products	What are the main benefits? Beneficiaries?
Potential Form, Elements and Aspects	Self-assessment. Outside evaluation advisable.	Capacity building and management improvement tool. Self-assessment form. Minimum standard.	Self-assessment form or outside evaluation? Financing? Main areas/issues?

Table 5: Research Participants

Respondent	Position Respondent	Interview length (Minutes)
RP1	Responsible Tourism and Certification Expert	30
RP2	Pro-Poor and Sustainable Tourism Expert	80
RP3	Co-Founder CBT-I and CBT Expert	30
RP4	Programme Coordinator INDECON	35
RP5	Former Programme Coordinator CCBEN	25
RP6	Co-Founder CBT-I, Former CEO CBT-I	40

Table 6: ASEAN-CBTS Criteria (Source: Adapted from Carter, 2014).

Criteria
1. Community Ownership and Management
2. Contribution to Social Well-Being
3. Conserving and Improving the Environment
4. Encouraging Interaction between the Local Community and Guests
5. Quality Tour and Guiding Services
6. Ensuring Quality Food and Beverage Services
7. Ensuring Quality Accommodations
8. Ensuring Performance of (in-bound) CBT Friendly Tour Operators (FTO)